UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,044	01/28/2004	Michael J. Freeman	2050.071US4	9597

44367   7590   11/17/2008
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/OPEN TV
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER
CHIN, RICKY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2423	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/765,044	FREEMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RICKY CHIN	2423	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 August 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8-11-08</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   The terminal disclaimer filed on August, 7, 2008 disclaiming the terminal portion
of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date
of U.S. Patent No. 5,861,881 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal
disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's response filed August 7, 2008 has been considered but is moot in
view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant also argues that the Wolzien reference
which teaches the distribution of URL's within television content such that the television
receiver may access a web site at the designated URL differs from a system that
integrates video, audio, or graphics signals into television content being displayed to a
viewer. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Wolzien (col.7 lines 43- col. 8 lines 1-15)
discloses that the information signals received from an online information provider may
be displayed as a still or moving images in place of the displayed video signal or may be
displayed as part of a picture within picture display in conjunction with the ordinarily
displayed video. Thus, the system in Wolzien integrates graphics and video signals into
television content being displayed to a viewer.

Priority

3.   This application discloses and claims only subject matter disclosed in prior
application no. 08/815,168 filed on 3/11/1997 and 08/598,382 filed 02/08/1996, and

names an inventor or inventors named in the prior application. The elements used in

this application such as URL, audio signals, branching codes, Web, internet etc. could

not be found anywhere in any prior applications of 08/443,607; 08/166,608 and

07/797,298. Therefore, the effective filing date of the instant application is February 8,

1996.

Double Patenting

4.   A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its

support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or

discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis

added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to

identical subject matter. See Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894); In re

Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164

USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

        The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created

doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent

and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims

are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated

by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29

USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163

USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may

be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be

commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of

activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal

disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR

3.73(b).

5.   Claims 1-12 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double

patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,079,176 in view of

Wolzien, US 5,761,606. The application claims merely add the limitations of resource

locators specifying one or more internet information addresses of related internet

information segments obtained from the internet and of a second input comprising a

connection to a computer network for receiving digitally compressed video, audio, and

graphics signals. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention was made to have modified the patented claims 1-5 to have resource

locators specifying internet addresses of related internet information segments so as to provide the user via a second input comprising a connection to a computer network for receiving digitally compressed video, audio, and graphical signals as taught by Wolzien (See col. 6 lines 7-50 and Fig. 1, 10; col. 6 lines 15-30; col. 7 lines 43- col. 8 lines 1-15) as to provide an alternative way to obtain additional or enhance related information from the internet.

Claims 1-12 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 10/126480 in view of Wolzien, US 5,761,606. The application claims merely add the limitations of resource locators specifying one or more internet information addresses of related internet information segments obtained from the internet and of a second input comprising a connection to a computer network for receiving digitally compressed video, audio, and graphics signals. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the patented claims 1-5 to have resource locators specifying internet addresses of related internet information segments so as to provide the user via a second input comprising a connection to a computer network for receiving digitally compressed video, audio, and graphical signals as taught by Wolzien(See col. 6 lines 7-50 and Fig. 1, 10; col. 6 lines 15-30; col. 7 lines 43- col. 8 lines 1-15) as to provide an alternative way to obtain additional or enhance related information from the internet. This is a _provisional_ obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention
was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability
shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-4 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bennett, US 5,068,733 in view of Harper et al., US 5,585,858, and in further view

of Wolzien, US 5,761,606.

        Regarding claim 1, Bennett discloses a live interactive programming system (See

Abstract), said live interactive digital programming system comprising: a viewer

television reception system for receiving live interactive programming (col.1 lines 59-

69), the live interactive programming comprising a plurality of video, audio (col. 1 lines

33-47); a viewer interface for receiving input from a viewer (col.1. lines 59-68);

a first input, said first input for receiving said live interactive programming comprising a

stream of said plurality of video, audio, and graphics signals (col.1 lines 59-68);

a microprocessor connected to the viewer interface, for selecting at least one of the

video, audio, or graphics signals from said first input and directing a switch to the

selected at least one video, audio, or graphics signals (col.2 lines 18-54 which discloses

video and audio switchers); a means for displaying the selected video signal (col. 2 lines

41-60); and a means for outputting the selected at least one video, audio, of graphics

signals (col.2 lines 41-60).

Bennett does not explicitly teach of branching codes, digital video/audio, and

graphics signals which are digitally compressed, decompressor/decoder, connected to

the demultiplexer for decompressing the demultiplexed selected at least one video,

audio, or graphics signals. OFFICIAL NOTICE is taken by the examiner to note that a

decompressor/decoder is notoriously well-known in the art and would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented a decoder for the mere

benefit of being able to reproduce and display the digital video and audio. Furthermore,

Harper discloses digital audio/video (Abstract) being digitally compressed (Fig.10 ,

elements 500 and 504), branching codes and graphics signals, the reception system

comprising (Col. 7 lines 11-51);the selection of the video and audio signals and the

predetermined time of each selection a function of the branching codes and the

received viewer entries (col. 8 lines 15-33);

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bennett to incorporate digitally

compressed video, audio, graphics, and branching codes as taught by Harper to

provide a fuller interactivity for the user to the system with regards to available content

being capable of being received by viewer entry.

The combination of Bennett and Harper does not explicitly teach of a second input,

said second input comprising a connection to a computer network for receiving digitally

compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and for selecting from said first input or

second input; However, in the same field of endeavor, Wolzien teaches of selection to a second input comprising a connection to a computer network (See col. 6 lines 7-50 and Fig. 1, 10 which discloses connection from the receiver and the online information provider and user selection to access the information from user interaction) for receiving digitally compressed video, audio, and graphics signals (See [Abstract]; col. 6 lines 15-30; col. 7 lines 43- col. 8 lines 1-15 which discloses digital video, audio and graphics signals). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in at the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bennett and Harper of providing compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and to have incorporated a connection to a computer network for receiving video, audio, and graphic signals as taught by Wolzien to provide fuller interactivity such as receiving supplemental information about content on user request.

Regarding claim 2, the combination teaches all the claim limitations of the live interactive digital programming system of claim 1, further the combination teaches of wherein the plurality of digitally compressed video signals from said first input ([Harper],Fig. 4, 320) corresponds to different predetermined camera angles of an event ([Bennett], col.1, lines 59-69).

Regarding claim 3, the combination teaches all of the claim limitations of the live interactive digital programming system of claim 1, further the combination teaches of wherein the microprocessor selects one of the graphics signals (trigger points) at a

predetermined time, the selection of the graphics signal a function of the branching codes and the input from viewer, and further comprising a means, connected to the microprocessor, for presenting the selected graphics signal on the display means ([Harper], col. 15, lines 48 to col. 16, lines 1-25 and col. 18. lines 60- col. 19 lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 4, the combination teaches all of the claim limitations of the live interactive digital programming system of claim 1, further the combination teaches of wherein the outputting means presents at least one interrogatory to the viewer, the content of the interrogatory involving program options, and the input from the viewer correspond to collected input from the viewer via the viewer interface in response to the interrogatories ([Bennett], col.3 lines 5-11).

Regarding claim 8, The combination of Bennett and Harper discloses a live interactive digital programming system, said live interactive digital programming system comprising: a viewer television reception system for receiving live interactive programming, the live interactive programming comprising a plurality of video, audio, branching codes; a viewer interface for receiving input from a viewer ; a first input, said first input for receiving said live interactive programming comprising a stream of said plurality of video, audio, branching codes and graphics signals; a microprocessor connected to the viewer interface, for selecting at least one of the video, audio, or graphics signals from said first input and directing a switch to the selected at least one video, audio, function of the branching codes, or graphics signals; and a means for

outputting the selected at least one video, audio, of graphics signals (See analysis of

Claim 1).

  The combination of Bennett and Harper does not explicitly teach of one or more

uniform resource locators specifying one or more Internet addresses of related Internet

information segments obtained from Web sites on the Internet and of a second input,

said second input comprising a connection to a computer network for receiving digitally

compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and for selecting from said first input or

second input;

  However, in the same field of endeavor, Wolzien discloses a system for providing

direct access to an online information services provider through an address embedded

in a video or audio program and wherein the information segment address is a URL

(col. 5 lines 45- col.6 lines 1-18).Furthermore, Wolzien teaches of selection to a second

input comprising a connection to a computer network (See col. 6 lines 7-50 and Fig. 1,

10 which discloses connection from the receiver and the online information provider and

user selection to access the information from user interaction) for receiving digitally

compressed video, audio, and graphics signals (See [Abstract]; col. 6 lines 15-30; col. 7

lines 43- col. 8 lines 1-15 which discloses digital video, audio and graphics signals being

received). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in at the art at

the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bennett and Harper of

providing compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and to have incorporated a

connection to a computer network for receiving video, audio, and graphic signals using

said internet addresses as taught by Wolzien to provide fuller interactivity such as receiving supplemental information about content on user request.

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Bennett, Harper, and Wolzien disclose the live interactive digital programming system of claim 8, the combination further teaches of comprising: and a decompressor/decoder, for decompressing the demultiplexed selected at least one video, audio signals, or graphics signal (See analysis of claim 1).

Regarding claims 10-12 the claims have been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 2-4.

8.   Claims (5-7) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett, US 5,068,733 in view of Harper et al., US 5,585,858, and in further view of Wolzien, US 5,761,606 as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Wachob, US 5,231,494.

Regarding claims 5-7, the claims has been analyzed and rejected using the same rationale of claims 1-3. The combination of Bennett, Harper, and Wolzien teach all of the claim limitations of claims 1-3. However, the combination of does not explicitly teach of a memory for storing a viewer profile.

Wachob discloses a memory for storing a viewer profile (col. 5 lines 56-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to have combined the teachings of Bennett,

Harper, and Wolzien to incorporate a memory for storing a viewer profile as taught by

Wachob to be able to better characterize the viewer.

9.   Claims 1-4 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bennett, US 5,068,733 in view of Hoarty, US 5,412,720 in further view of Barstow

et al., US 5,189,630, and in further view of Wolzien, US 5,761,606.

        Regarding claim 1, Bennett discloses a live interactive programming system (See

Abstract), said live interactive digital programming system comprising: a viewer

television reception system for receiving live interactive programming (col.1 lines 59-

69), the live interactive programming comprising a plurality of video, audio (col. 1 lines

33-47); a viewer interface for receiving input from a viewer (col.1. lines 59-68);

a first input, said first input for receiving said live interactive programming comprising a

stream of said plurality of video, audio, and graphics signals (col.1 lines 59-68);

a microprocessor connected to the viewer interface, for selecting at least one of the

video, audio, or graphics signals from said first input and directing a switch to the

selected at least one video, audio, or graphics signals (col.2 lines 18-54 which discloses

video and audio switchers); a means for displaying the selected video signal (col. 2 lines

41-60); and a means for outputting the selected at least one video, audio, of graphics

signals (col.2 lines 41-60).

Bennett does not explicitly teach of branching codes, digital video/audio, and graphics signals which are digitally compressed, decompressor/decoder, connected to the demultiplexer for decompressing the demultiplexed selected at least one video, audio, or graphics signals. OFFICIAL NOTICE is taken by the examiner to note that a decompressor/decoder is notoriously well-known in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented a decoder for the mere benefit of being able to reproduce and display the digital video and audio. Furthermore, Hoarty discloses demultiplexed digital signals being digitally compressed (col. 4 lines 22-40 and col.7 lines 1-20).

Bennett and Hoarty do not explicitly teach of branching codes; the selection of the video and audio signals and the predetermined time of each selection a function of the branching codes and the received viewer entries. However, in the same field of endeavor, Barstow discloses branching codes the selection of the video and audio signals and the predetermined time of each selection a function of the branching codes and the received viewer entries (Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 and col. 5 lines 47 – col. 6 lines 22 which discloses software providing a menu of possible action types and prompts for relevant information about start and stop times and parameters after an action type is selected).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bennett and Hoarty with that of Barstow as a whole for the mere benefit of providing a fuller interactivity for the user to the system and the received viewer entries.

The combination of Bennett, Barstow, and Hoarty does not explicitly teach of a second input, said second input comprising a connection to a computer network for receiving digitally compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and for selecting from said first input or second input; However, in the same field of endeavor, Wolzien teaches of selection to a second input comprising a connection to a computer network (See col. 6 lines 7-50 and Fig. 1, 10 which discloses connection from the receiver and the online information provider and user selection to access the information from user interaction) for receiving digitally compressed video, audio, and graphics signals (See [Abstract]; col. 6 lines 15-30; col. 7 lines 43- col. 8 lines 1-15 which discloses digital video, audio and graphics signals). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in at the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bennett, Hoarty, and Barstow of providing compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and to have incorporated a connection to a computer network for receiving video, audio, and graphic signals as taught by Wolzien to provide fuller interactivity such as receiving supplemental information about content on user request.

Regarding claim 2, the combination teaches all the claim limitations of the live interactive digital programming system of claim 1, further the combination teaches of wherein the plurality of digitally compressed video signals([Hoarty], col. 4 lines 22-40 and col.7 lines 1-20) corresponds to different predetermined camera angles of an event ([Bennett], col.1, lines 59-69).

Regarding claim 3, The combination teaches all of the claim limitations of the live interactive digital programming system of claim 1, further the combination teaches of wherein the microprocessor selects one of the graphics signals (trigger points) at a predetermined time, the selection of the graphics signal a function of the branching codes and the received viewer entries, and further comprising a means, connected to the microprocessor, for presenting the selected graphics signal on the display means ([Barstow], see col. 5 lines 47 – col. 6 lines 22 which discloses software (needs processor to execute) providing a menu of possible action types and prompts for relevant information about start and stop times and parameters after an action type is selected; col.2 lines 45-60 which discloses that the viewer is able to select a perspective view for a visual image that is displayed on the display).

Regarding claim 4, the combination teach all of the claim limitations of the live interactive digital programming system of claim 1, further the combination teaches of wherein the display means presents at least one interrogatory to the viewer, the content of the interrogatory involving program options, and the viewer entries correspond to collected entries from the viewer via the viewer interface in response to the interrogatories ([Bennett], col.3 lines 5-11).

Regarding claim 8, The combination of Bennett, Hoarty, and Barstow discloses a live interactive digital programming system, said live interactive digital programming system comprising: a viewer television reception system for receiving live interactive

programming, the live interactive programming comprising a plurality of video, audio,

and branching codes; a viewer interface for receiving input from a viewer ; a first input,

said first input for receiving said live interactive programming comprising a stream of

said plurality of video, audio, branching codes, and graphics signals; a microprocessor

connected to the viewer interface, for selecting at least one of the video, audio, or

graphics signals from said first input and directing a switch to the selected at least one

video, audio, function of the branching codes or graphics signals; and a means for

outputting the selected at least one video, audio, of graphics signals (See analysis of

Claim 1).

      The combination of Bennett, Hoarty, and Barstow does not explicitly teach of one

or more uniform resource locators specifying one or more Internet addresses of related

Internet information segments obtained from Web sites on the Internet and of a second

input, said second input comprising a connection to a computer network for receiving

digitally compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and for selecting from said first

input or second input;

      However, in the same field of endeavor, Wolzien discloses a system for providing

direct access to an online information services provider through an address embedded

in a video or audio program and wherein the information segment address is a URL

(col. 5 lines 45- col.6 lines 1-18).Furthermore, Wolzien teaches of selection to a second

input comprising a connection to a computer network (See col. 6 lines 7-50 and Fig. 1,

10 which discloses connection from the receiver and the online information provider and

user selection to access the information from user interaction) for receiving digitally

compressed video, audio, and graphics signals (See [Abstract]; col. 6 lines 15-30; col. 7

lines 43- col. 8 lines 1-15 which discloses digital video, audio and graphics signals being

received). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in at the art at

the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bennett, Hoarty, and

Barstow of providing compressed video, audio, and graphics signals and to have

incorporated a connection to a computer network for receiving video, audio, and graphic

signals using said internet addresses as taught by Wolzien to provide fuller interactivity

such as receiving supplemental information about content on user request.

Regarding claims 9-12, the claims have been analyzed and rejected for the same

reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4.

10.   Claims (5-7) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bennett, US 5,068,733 in view of Hoarty, US 5,412,720, in view of Barstow et. al.,US

5,189,630, in further view of Wolzien, US 5,761,606 as applied to claim 1, and in further

view of Wachob, US 5,231,494.

Regarding claims 5-7, the claims have been analyzed and rejected using the

same rationale of claims 1-3. The combination of Bennett, Hoarty, Barstow, and

Wolzien teach all of the claim limitations of claims 1-3. However, the combination does

not explicitly teach of a memory for storing a viewer profile.

Wachob discloses a memory for storing a viewer profile (col. 5 lines 56-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to have combined the teaches of Bennett,

Hoarty, Barstow, and Wolzien with that of Wachob as a whole for the mere benefit of

being able to better characterize the viewer.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ricky Chin whose telephone number is 571-270-3753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

     If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on 571-272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Ricky Chin/
Patent Examiner
AU 2423
(571) 270-3753
Ricky.Chin@uspto.gov

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423